



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/836,965	04/17/2001	Alfred C. She	51040.P005	8500

25943 7590 01/12/2005

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.
PACWEST CENTER, SUITES 1600-1900
1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER

TRUONG, THANHNGA B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2135

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/836,965

Applicant(s)

SHE ET AL.

Examiner

Thanhnga B. Truong

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 April 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>121602</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-8, 10-18, 20-29, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright (US 6,052,466), and further in view of Nakamura (US 5,159,633) and Coppersmith et al (US 6,192,129).

a. Referring to claim 1:

i. Wright teaches:

(1) generating in real time a first deciphering round key based on a deciphering key; incrementally deciphering a ciphered text for a first round using the real time generated first deciphering round key; generating in real time a second deciphering round key based on said generated first deciphering round key while said incremental deciphering for a first round is being performed; and incrementally deciphering the partially deciphered text for a second round using the real time generated second deciphering round key [i.e., reference is now made to Figure 4 wherein there is shown a flow diagram for secondary private key generation. For a bi-directional data communication between Party A and Party B as illustrated in Figure 3, the private key K actually comprises (i.e., may be split into) two keys K.sub.AB and K.sub.BA. The need for two private keys when handling bi-directional communications is required to ensure that the same cipher stream is never used for the encryption of different plaintext sequences. The first private key K.sub.AB is used to generate a forward first cipher stream C.sub.AB, and the second private key K.sub.BA is used to generate a reverse first cipher stream C.sub.BA. The forward first cipher stream C.sub.AB is then partitioned and indexed to generate a first (or forward channel) secondary private key C.sub.ABi sequence, with individual ones in the sequence used

to generate a forward second cipher stream C.sub.AB ' that is used by security device 112A to encrypt Party A PT.sub.i data communications, and by security device 112B to decrypt Party A CT.sub.i data communications. The reverse first cipher stream C.sub.BA, on the other hand, is then partitioned and indexed to generate a second (or reverse channel) secondary private key C.sub.BAi sequence, with individual ones in the sequence used to generate a reverse second cipher stream C.sub.BA ' that is used by security device 112B to encrypt Party B PT.sub.i data communications, and by security device 112A to decrypt Party B CT.sub.i data communications (column 6, lines 22-45). In addition, in passive operation, no message exchange between Party A and Party B regarding synchronization is required as the index is merely passively incremented with each encryption or decryption and monitoring of the index field 148 (Figure 5) of each sent ciphertext sequence CT.sub.i (column 8, lines 22-26). Furthermore, Figure 8 describes more details in incrementing with each encryption or decryption process **(column 8, lines 48-67 through column 9, lines 1-21)**.

ii. Although Wright is silent about the real time communication type information and how many rounds of cipher processing have been performed, Nakamura and Coppersmith teaches:

(1) in multimedia networks for transmitting real-time communication type information which must be encrypted in real time, and storage type information which requires safety-guaranteed encryption and certification of an information source via the same medium, Nakamura's invention is applicable to various other systems, and does not depend on network systems, and kinds of terminals **(column 12, lines 18-25 of Nakamura)**. In addition, encryption/decryption of real-time communication type information by the secret-key system of this embodiment is described more in details in **column 6, lines 44-67 through column 7, lines 17 of Nakamura**.

(2) Referring to Figure 3, The first Step 100 is to initialize the iteration counter, "r", to keep track of how many rounds of cipher processing have been performed. At Step 110, a comparison is made between the iteration counter and the number of rounds of processing required. While the iteration counter is less than

Art Unit: 2135

the number of rounds, the processing will continue on to Step 120. However, if the two values compared are equal, then encryption of the block has completed. It will be understood that the encryption process for each block of data forming the input file is identical, and that the process of Figure 3 is used on each successive block until all blocks of the input file have been encrypted (**column 7, lines 48-59 of Coppersmith**).

iii. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) have included the real-time communication type information in Wright so that the encrypted information cannot be easily decrypted (**column 2, lines 37-38 of Nakamura**).

(2) have included the number of rounds of cipher processing in Wright since the goal of a cipher is to be computationally infeasible to "break"--that is, it must be nearly impossible to "guess" or derive the original data content from any series of computations that can be performed on the transformed data, absent knowledge of how the encryption was accomplished (**column 1, lines 60-65 of Coppersmith**).

iv. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) have included the real-time communication type information since when a secret-key for encrypting real-time communication type information is determined in advance, a communication is performed using the public-key cryptosystem used in encryption of storage type information, and the determined secret-key is abandoned after each communication. Thus, the secret-key for encrypting real-time communication type information can be prevented from being found out by a third party, and high-speed information can be safely transmitted (**column 3, lines 16-24 of Nakamura**).

(2) have included the number of rounds of cipher processing because one way to make a cipher stronger is to increase the number of rounds of ciphering performed: with each successive transformation, the resulting encryption becomes more difficult to break. Another way to increase the strength is to increase the size of the key. Since the contents of the key remain secret, increasing the

Art Unit: 2135

size adds another level of difficulty for anyone trying to deduce what transformations may have been performed on the original data, because they are unlikely to guess the random number combination making up the key **(column 2, lines 31-40 of Coppersmith).**

b. Referring to claim 2:

i. Wright further teaches:

(1) wherein said first and second deciphering round keys comprise first and second plurality of round key data words respectively, and said generation in real time of said second deciphering round keys comprises iteratively generating said second plurality of round key data words over a plurality of iterations **[i.e., each transmitted ciphertext data packet then includes an index identifying which of the plurality of secondary keys was used for the encryption (column 4, lines 15-19)].**

c. Referring to claim 3:

i. Wright further teaches:

(1) wherein said iterative generation of said second plurality of round key data words over a plurality of iterations comprises generating one of said second plurality round key data words each iteration, including performance of a first XOR operation on a first and a second round key data word during each iteration **[i.e., referring to Figure 3, the encrypting/decrypting device 118 comprises a first cipher stream generator 120, a partitioning and indexing device 121, a second cipher stream generator 123 and an exclusive OR (XOR) multiplier 122 (column 5, lines 9-13)].**

d. Referring to claims 4-8, 13-18, 24-29:

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claims 1 and 3, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 1 and 3 above. In addition, referring to Figures 6 and 7 of Coppersmith for claims 6,8, 15,26.

e. Referring to claims 10 and 21:

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claim 1, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

f. Referring to claims 11 and 22:

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claim 2, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 2 above.

g. Referring to claims 12 and 23:

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claim 3, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 3 above.

h. Referring to claims 20 and 31:

i. Nakamura further teaches:

(1) wherein said routing apparatus is disposed on an integrated circuit [i.e., In Figures 7 and 8, reference numerals 71 and 81 denote these information equipments; 72 and 82, clock extraction circuits for extracting clock components from information signals; 73 and 83; pseudo random number generators; 74 and 84, control circuits for controlling synchronization of communications, generation of pseudo random numbers, automatic operations of the information equipments, and the like; 75 and 85, EX-OR gates for logically EX-ORing signals; and 76 and 86, transmission/reception circuits for transmitting/receiving signals onto/from transmission lines (column 11, lines 2737)].

3. Claims 9, 19, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright (US 6,052,466), Nakamura (US 5,159,633) and Coppersmith et al (US 6,192,129), and further in view of Adler (US 4,255,811).

a. Referring to claims 9, 19, 30:

i. Wright, Nakamura, and Coppersmith teach the claimed subject matter except for:

(1) A rotational shifter

ii. However, Adler teaches:

(1) Referring to Figures 1-3, it has been found that a highly secure cryptography method is possible utilizing a series of data manipulations

readily realizable from standard binary computer circuitry. These operations include modulo-2 addition, addition-with-carry, circular shifting or rotation of a partially encoded or decoded block of data, together with a continuous regeneration of a unique encryption key originally supplied to the system prior to encoding or decoding. By changing the addition with carry to subtraction with carry, reversing the direction of rotation and the direction of key generation the same hardware may be utilized for both encoding and decoding (**column 3, lines 36-47**).

iii. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) have included a rotator in Wright in order to provide a cryptographic method and apparatus capable of maintaining a high degree of secrecy during the transmission or storage of binary data (**column 3, lines 49-51 of Adler**).

iv. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) have included a rotator in Wright to provide such a method and apparatus capable of enciphering a clear text message by means of a product cipher of successive blocks of said message, each product cipher comprising a plurality of linear and affine transformations which are a function of a unique subscriber key configuration, wherein each transformation utilizes a key input which is itself a subset or function of said key and further including a unique nonlinear transformation comprising addition-with-carry of a partially enciphered or deciphered block of data under control of said subscriber key (**column 3, lines 65-67 through column 4, lines 1-9 of Adler**).

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. DeBellis et al (US 6, 044, 388) discloses pseudorandom numbers are generated in a cryptographic module in a cryptographically strong manner by combining a time-dependent value with a secret value and passing the result through a one-way hash function to generate a hash value from which a random number is generated (see abstract).

Art Unit: 2135

b. Lampson et al (US 5,161,193) discloses Cryptographic apparatus, and a related method for its operation, for in-line encryption and decryption of data packets transmitted in a communication network (see abstract).

c. Chou et al (US5,638,444) discloses Communication between a plurality of computers which are intercoupled or networked is provided in confidential form using password protection in combination with a special hardware token which is used to generate a one-time random session ciphering key (see abstract).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanhnga (Tanya) Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-3858.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached at 571-272-3859. The fax and phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

TBT

January 4, 2005


KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100